



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,128	01/17/2006	Tatsuo Shimizu	06.22.01.P	7793
35870	7590	09/04/2009		
APEX JURIS, PLLC 12733 LAKE CITY WAY NORTHEAST SEATTLE, WA 98125				
EXAMINER				
BARROW, AMANDA J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1795				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/565,128

Applicant(s)

SHIMIZU ET AL.

Examiner

AMANDA BARROW

Art Unit

1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2, 3, 7 and 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 8 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/003)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I and Species 1, claims 1,4-6,8,10, in the reply filed on 6/17/2009 is acknowledged.

Claims 2, 3, 7 and 9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant's response cited no arguments and thus, the election is treated as an election made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6/17/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "said conductive material" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tajima et al. (JP Patent Application 62235704 (Patent Number JP401081167A)).

Regarding claim 1, Tajima discloses a charge collector/electrode ("current collecting structure") that includes a conductive substrate ("current collecting substrate") that has a carbon material directly deposited on the conductive substrate ("current collecting substrate") without the use of binders (see abstract).

Regarding claim 4, Tajima discloses that a charge carrier capable of reversible intercalation and deintercalation ("electrode active material") is supported on the carbon material deposited on the substrate (see abstract).

Regarding claim 6, Tajima discloses that the electrode is to be used in a battery (see abstract above).

8. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tajima et al. (JP Patent Application 62235704 (Patent Number JP401081167A)).

Regarding claim 8, Tajima discloses a charge collector/electrode that includes a conductive substrate ("current collecting substrate") that has a carbon material ("electrode active material") directly deposited on the conductive substrate ("current collecting substrate") without the use of binders (see abstract above).

Regarding claim 10, Tajima discloses that a charge carrier capable of reversible intercalation and deintercalation ("conductive material") is supported on the carbon material deposited on the substrate (see abstract above). Tajima disclose that the charge carrier is lithium metal powder (oral translation by USPTO translator, Akiko Smith, page 3, upper right column line 18 through lower left column, line 1) which is a conductive material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima et al. (JP Patent Application 62235704 (Patent Number JP401081167A) as applied to claims 1,4,6 above and further in view of Nakai et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0122983 A1).

Regarding claim 5, Tajima discloses that the charge carrier ("electrode active material") is a lithium metal powder of about 140 mesh (105 microns) (oral translation by USPTO translator, Akiko Smith, page 3, upper right column line 18 through lower left column, line 1). Therefore, Tajima does not disclose that the electrode active material has a mean particle diameter of less than 2 microns; however, Nakai teaches that in using electrode active materials that have a small average particle diameter (0.1 to 2 microns), the reaction area of the active material is optimized therefore improving the power characteristic without enlarging the size of the battery (paragraph 13).

The discovery of an optimum value of a known result effective variable, without producing any new or unexpected results, is within the ambit of a person of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) (see MPEP § 2144.05, II.). The known result effective variable in this case is diameter of the electrode active material with the known result that using particles with a small diameter increases the reaction area of the particles which in turn improves the power characteristic (Nakai – paragraph 13). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the mean particle diameter of the electrode active materials taught by Tajima to have a smaller diameter as taught by Nakai as no new or unexpected results are achieved.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMANDA BARROW whose telephone number is (571)270-

7867. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5pm EST. Monday-Friday, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dah-Wei Yuan can be reached on 571-272-1295. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/AMANDA BARROW/
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795